



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/079,844	02/22/2002	Norio Tanaka	122.1492	7542
21171 7590 03/18/2008 STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005				
EXAMINER				
CASLER, TRACI				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3629				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/18/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/079,844

Applicant(s)

TANAKA, NORIO

Examiner

Traci L. Casler

Art Unit

3629

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 December 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 2-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to papers filed on December 7, 2007.

Claims 1, 4 and 7-9 have been amended.

Claims 13-16 have been added.

Claim 11 has been cancelled

Claims 1-10 and 12-16 are pending.

Claims 1-10 and 12-16 are rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

2. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6, 505,772 Patent 5,614,703 Martin et al; Hotel Check-in System with Wireless Communication in view of NPL www.omnihotels.org retrieved from www.archive.org anylinkage December 2, 2000. Hereinafter referred to as Martin and Omni respectively.

3. As to claims 1, 4 and 7-9 and 13 Mollett teaches:

4. a lodging management system conjunction step of transmitting the room number of the guest to the lodging management system to obtain the information about the

guest concerned; and *(coding the card as room key C. 4 I. 62-63 and that card is coded to identify the holder C. 4 I. 12-13)*

5. a service indication step of comparing a service management table for the management of attributes of services of the hotel facilities and for the management of availabilities of the hotel facilities, with the guest's own attributes in the information about the guest which has been obtained from the lodging management system, and of indicating service suitable for the guest's attributes; *(the card identifies they types of goods and services entitled by the card holder)(C. 4 I. 64-65).*

6. Mollett fails to teach the attributes of the users, however Omni teaches

7. wherein the attributes indicate the .quest's status as a very important person (VIP), a repeat customer, a parent, a child, an aged person, a blacklisted person, a physically challenged person, or any combination thereof *(.Pg. 4 ¶ 1 & PG. 4 ¶ 1-Guest special needs preferences and Executive services plans.)* It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the known element of Omni's guest attributes with the known management system of Mollett as in combination they would have performed the same functions as they did separately to yield predictable results

8. Mollette fails to teach the room number being assign and input into the system, However Martin teaches:

9. a room-number-input step of obtaining and inputting a room number of a guest when the guest visits the hotel facility; *(C. 2 I. 47-51 Assigning a room number based on user preferences).* It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the

Art Unit: 3629

method of Martin's hotel room assignment step with that of Mollett's service management method to assign room to a user based on their preferences. It is within the capabilities of one skilled in the art at the time of invention to assign hotel rooms based on user preferences and to manage resort and amusement services to obtain the predictable results of assigning a room number and it being transmitted to the multi-service network.

10. As to claims 2 and 5 Mollett teaches a service management system but fails to teach transmitting the hotel room number for charging at a hotel facility to be paid at check out. However, Martin teaches using the room key(include number code as previously identified in the above rejection) for use in charges for a hotel restaurant(C. 10 I. 53-56) One of ordinary skill in the art of hotel/resort management would have recognized that applying the known technique Martins charging of hotel restaurant bill to be paid at check out with Molletts service management of resorts and amusement parks yielded predictable results and yielded an improved system. It would have been recognized that by applying the technique of Martin to the teachings of Mollett would have yielded predictable results because the level of ordinary skill in the art demonstrated by the references applied show the ability to incorporate such charging processing features into similar hotel/resort management charging processings. Further, it would have been recognized by those skilled in the art that the combination would result in an improved system that would not only allow the user to prepay for preferred services with the hotel/resort but also allow the use of additional services not prepared to be purchased and settle at the time of check-out.

Art Unit: 3629

11. As to claims 3 , 6 and 12 Mollett(C.5 l. 44) teaches via incorporation of Sear US Patent 5,566,327 C. 8 l. 24-27 contents of the guest card are displayed on onto the terminal. The examiner notes the location of the terminal in which the information is displayed in non-functional descriptive material. The functions of the system and methods would be performed the same regardless of the location. This limitation is merely drawn to the intended use of the method and/or system.

12. As to claim 10 Mollett teaches ; *identifying the types of good sand services the user is entitled to C. 4 l. 64-65*

13. As to claims 14 and 15 Mollett teaches services available to the user, although Mollett does not explicitly teach exact services these limitations are non-functional descriptive material. These limitations merely describe the types or kinds of services that a facility offers and does not change the steps of how the services are compared and indicated to the user.

14. As to claim 16 Omni teaches indicating to parents top attractions(available services) in the area(Pg 4 ¶ 3). It would have been obvious to on skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the known element of Omni's guest attributes/ Kids with the known management system of Mollett as in combination they would have performed the same functions as they did separately to yield predictable results of informing parents of the attractions that are available that meet the desires of kids identified staying at the hotel.

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Traci L. Casler whose telephone number is 571-272-6809. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:00 am-4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on 571-272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Traci L Casler/
Examiner, Art Unit 3629

/Tan Dean D. Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3629